

REMARKS

Claims 1, 14, and 15 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-6 and 9-20 are pending.

Claims 1, 14, and 15 have been amended in response to the objection to the claims. The language suggested in the Office Action may have been understood to have changed the intended meaning of the claims, which are intended to convey that the recited pointer is stored in a work queue associated with said one of said plurality of processors.

Claims 1-6 and 9-20 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Shanklin, Salapura, Blair, and Graham. The rejection is respectfully traversed. The Graham reference was added to the combination asserted in the prior office action to address a work and return queue structure described by applicants for managing the use of memory and processor capacity in a tracking system. Graham describes a “completion queue 404”, col. 7, lines 57-67, in which “completion queue elements” are stored, col. 8, lines 8-22; but Graham does not appear to describe how data stored in the completion queue is used. By contrast, claims 1, 14, and 15 as amended recite reading the pointer from the return queue and using the pointer read from the return queue to add the storage location to a free list of storage locations available to be assigned to a network communication interface. As such, claims 1, 14, and 15 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 2-6, 9-13, and 22 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above. Likewise, claims 16-21 depend from claim 15 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

New claims 21 and 22 recite that at least a subset of the processors are configured to perform two or more tasks concurrently. Shanklin describes sensors that handle multiple sessions, col. 7, lines 20-67, but does not describe any sensor doing so concurrently as recited in the claims, as opposed to serially for example. Shanklin also describes a network analyzer that correlates events across multiple sessions, but such correlation is a single task involving data from multiple sessions, which is not the same as performing concurrently two or more network


flow analysis related tasks as recited in the claims. As such, claims 21 and 22 are believed to be allowable.

The foregoing amendments are not to be taken as an admission of unpatentability of any of the claims prior to the amendments.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10-9-08



William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2592
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT, YI & JAMES LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014